



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : Guha, et al.
Serial No. : 10/607,932
Filed : June 26, 2003
Title : Method And Apparatus For
Power-Efficient High-
Capacity Scalable Storage System

Art Unit : 2655
Examiner : Unassigned

Docket No.: 100112-001010US

Mail Stop PETITIONS
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RENEWED PETITION TO ADD CORRECT PRIORITY CLAIM UNDER 37 CFR § 1.78(a)(3)

Applicants filed a Petition Under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) on April 25, 2005 to claim priority to U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/407,299. A Decision On Petition Under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(6) was mailed on May 24, 2005 (copy attached for reference) noting certain deficiencies with the April 25 Petition. This Decision dismissed the April 25 Petition and requested that Applicants provide a substitute Amendment, a Power of Attorney and a renewed Petition.

Accordingly, Applicants hereby request that the claim of priority for the above-reference patent application be changed in accordance with the Preliminary Amendment filed herewith. Appropriate corresponding corrections should be made to any relevant records. A new Power of Attorney for the above-identified application is also filed herewith.

The entire delay between the date the claim was due under paragraph (a)(2) of Section 1.78 and the date this claim was filed was unintentional.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING BY FIRST CLASS MAIL

I hereby certify under 37 CFR §1.8(a) that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage on the date indicated below and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.


Date of Deposit: July 13, 2005 By: Stephanie M. Brown Stephanie M. Brown

Applicants: Guha, et al.
Serial No. : 10/607,932
Filed : June 26, 2003
Page : 2 of 2

Docket No.: 100112-001010US

The surcharge of \$1,370.00 set forth in Section 1.17(t) was previously paid on April 25, 2005. No additional fee is believed due. Please apply any additional charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 50-3000.

Respectfully submitted,


Craig E. Shimmers
Reg. No. 33,281

Date: July 13, 2005



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov



OLA PIPER RUDNICK GRAY CARY US, LLP
2000 UNIVERSITY AVENUE
E. PALO ALTO, CA 94303-2248

COPY MAILED

MAY 24 2005

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of
Guha et al.

Application No. 10/607,932

Filed: June 26, 2003 1001/2

Attorney Docket No. 10012-001010US

:
:
: DECISION ON PETITION
: UNDER 37 CFR 1.78(a)(6)
:

This is a decision on the petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(6), filed April 25, 2005, to accept an unintentionally delayed claim under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) for the benefit of a prior-filed provisional application.

The petition is **DISMISSED**.

A petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(6) is only applicable to those applications filed on or after November 29, 2000. Further, the petition is appropriate only after expiration of the period specified in 37 CFR 1.78(a)(5)(ii) and must be filed during the pendency of the nonprovisional application. In addition, the petition must be accompanied by:

- (1) the reference required by 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) and 37 CFR 1.78(a)(5)(i) to the prior-filed application, unless previously submitted;
- (2) the surcharge set forth in § 1.17(t); and
- (3) a statement that the entire delay between the date the claim was due under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(5)(ii) and the date the claim was filed was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional.

The instant pending nonprovisional application was filed on June 26, 2003, within twelve months of the filing date of the prior-filed provisional application, Application No. 60/407,299, which was filed on September 3, 2002, and for which priority is claimed. A reference to the prior-filed provisional application appears in the petition as an amendment to the first sentence of the specification following the title.

However, the amendment is not acceptable as drafted since it improperly incorporates by reference the prior-filed application. Petitioner's attention is directed to Dart Industries v. Banner, 636 F.2d 684, 207 USPQ 273 (C.A.D.C. 1980), where the court drew a distinction between a permissible 35 U.S.C. § 120 statement and the impermissible introduction of new matter by way of incorporation by reference in a 35 U.S.C. § 120 statement. The court specifically stated:

Section 120 merely provides a mechanism whereby an application becomes entitled to benefit of the filing date of an earlier application disclosing the same subject matter. Common subject matter must be disclosed, in both

applications, either specifically or by an express incorporation-by-reference of prior disclosed subject matter. Nothing in section 120 itself operates to carry forward any disclosure from an earlier application. In re deSeversky, supra at 674, 177 USPQ at 146-147. Section 120 contains no magical disclosure-augmenting powers able to pierce new matter barriers. It cannot, therefore, "limit" the absolute and express prohibition against new matter contained in section 251.

In order for the incorporation by reference statement to be effective as a proper safeguard against the omission of a portion of a prior application, the incorporation by reference statement must be included in the specification-as-filed, or in an amendment specifically referred to in an oath or declaration executing the application. *See In re deSeversky, supra. Note also MPEP 201.06(c).*

Further, the amendment is also unacceptable because it is physically part of the instant petition and, as such, does not comply with 37 CFR 1.121, 1.52, or 1.4(c). Note that 37 CFR 1.121 states that amendments are made by filing a paper, in compliance with 1.52, directing that specified amendments be made. The pertinent section of 37 CFR 1.52 states that the claim (in this case, the claim for priority) must commence on a separate physical sheet. 37 CFR 1.4(c) states that each distinct subject, inquiry or order must be contained in a separate paper since different matters may be considered by different branches of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

In the instant petition, petitioner lists provisional Application No. 60/407,299, filed September 3, 2002, as entitled as "Method and Apparatus for Efficient Scalable Storage Management." However, USPTO records indicate that the above-noted provisional application is entitled "Method And Apparatus For Power-Efficient High-Capacity Scalable Storage System."

Accordingly, before the petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(6) can be granted, a substitute amendment¹ deleting the incorporation by reference statement and in compliance with the aforementioned rules, along with a renewed petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(6), is required.

There is no indication that the person signing the instant petition was ever given a power of attorney or authorization of agent to prosecute the above-identified application. If the person signing the instant petition desires to receive future correspondence regarding this application, the appropriate power of attorney or authorization of agent must be submitted. While a courtesy copy of this decision is being mailed to the person signing the instant petition, all future correspondence will be directed solely to the address currently of record until such time as appropriate instructions are received to the contrary.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:


By mail: Mail Stop PETITIONS
 Commissioner for Patents
 Post Office Box 1450
 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By hand: Customer Window located at:
 U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
 Customer Service Window Randolph Building
 401 Dulany Street
 Alexandria, VA 22314

¹ Note 37 CFR 1121

By fax: (703) 872-9306
ATTN: Office of Petitions

Any questions concerning this matter may be directed to Paralegal Liana Chase at (571) 272-3206.



Frances Hicks
Petitions Examiner
Office of Petitions
Office of the Deputy Commissioner
for Patent Examination Policy

cc: CHARLES J. KULAS
CARPTETER & KULAS, LLP
1900 EMBARCADERO ROAD, SUITE 109
PALO ALTO, CA 94303



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov



DLA PIPER RUDNICK GRAY CARY US, LLP
2000 UNIVERSITY AVENUE
E. PALO ALTO, CA 94303-2248

COPY MAILED
MAY 24 2005
OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of
Guha et al.

Application No. 10/607,932

Filed: June 26, 2003 *1001/2*

Attorney Docket No. ~~10012~~-001010US

:
:
: DECISION ON PETITION
: UNDER 37 CFR 1.78(a)(6)
:

This is a decision on the petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(6), filed April 25, 2005, to accept an unintentionally delayed claim under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) for the benefit of a prior-filed provisional application.

The petition is **DISMISSED**.

A petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(6) is only applicable to those applications filed on or after November 29, 2000. Further, the petition is appropriate only after expiration of the period specified in 37 CFR 1.78(a)(5)(ii) and must be filed during the pendency of the nonprovisional application. In addition, the petition must be accompanied by:

- (1) the reference required by 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) and 37 CFR 1.78(a)(5)(i) to the prior-filed application, unless previously submitted;
- (2) the surcharge set forth in § 1.17(t); and
- (3) a statement that the entire delay between the date the claim was due under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(5)(ii) and the date the claim was filed was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional.

The instant pending nonprovisional application was filed on June 26, 2003, within twelve months of the filing date of the prior-filed provisional application, Application No. 60/407,299, which was filed on September 3, 2002, and for which priority is claimed. A reference to the prior-filed provisional application appears in the petition as an amendment to the first sentence of the specification following the title.

However, the amendment is not acceptable as drafted since it improperly incorporates by reference the prior-filed application. Petitioner's attention is directed to Dart Industries v. Banner, 636 F.2d 684, 207 USPQ 273 (C.A.D.C. 1980), where the court drew a distinction between a permissible 35 U.S.C. § 120 statement and the impermissible introduction of new matter by way of incorporation by reference in a 35 U.S.C. § 120 statement. The court specifically stated:

Section 120 merely provides a mechanism whereby an application becomes entitled to benefit of the filing date of an earlier application disclosing the same subject matter. Common subject matter must be disclosed, in both

applications, either specifically or by an express incorporation-by-reference of prior disclosed subject matter. Nothing in section 120 itself operates to carry forward any disclosure from an earlier application. In re deSeversky, supra at 674, 177 USPQ at 146-147. Section 120 contains no magical disclosure-augmenting powers able to pierce new matter barriers. It cannot, therefore, "limit" the absolute and express prohibition against new matter contained in section 251.

In order for the incorporation by reference statement to be effective as a proper safeguard against the omission of a portion of a prior application, the incorporation by reference statement must be included in the specification-as-filed, or in an amendment specifically referred to in an oath or declaration executing the application. See In re deSeversky, supra. Note also MPEP 201.06(c).

Further, the amendment is also unacceptable because it is physically part of the instant petition and, as such, does not comply with 37 CFR 1.121, 1.52, or 1.4(c). Note that 37 CFR 1.121 states that amendments are made by filing a paper, in compliance with 1.52, directing that specified amendments be made. The pertinent section of 37 CFR 1.52 states that the claim (in this case, the claim for priority) must commence on a separate physical sheet. 37 CFR 1.4(c) states that each distinct subject, inquiry or order must be contained in a separate paper since different matters may be considered by different branches of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

In the instant petition, petitioner lists provisional Application No. 60/407,299, filed September 3, 2002, as entitled as "Method and Apparatus for Efficient Scalable Storage Management." However, USPTO records indicate that the above-noted provisional application is entitled "Method And Apparatus For Power-Efficient High-Capacity Scalable Storage System."

Accordingly, before the petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(6) can be granted, a substitute amendment¹ deleting the incorporation by reference statement and in compliance with the aforementioned rules, along with a renewed petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(6), is required.

There is no indication that the person signing the instant petition was ever given a power of attorney or authorization of agent to prosecute the above-identified application. If the person signing the instant petition desires to receive future correspondence regarding this application, the appropriate power of attorney or authorization of agent must be submitted. While a courtesy copy of this decision is being mailed to the person signing the instant petition, all future correspondence will be directed solely to the address currently of record until such time as appropriate instructions are received to the contrary.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:


By mail: Mail Stop PETITIONS
 Commissioner for Patents
 Post Office Box 1450
 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By hand: Customer Window located at:
 U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
 Customer Service Window Randolph Building
 401 Dulany Street
 Alexandria, VA 22314

¹ Note 37 CFR 1121

By fax: (703) 872-9306
ATTN: Office of Petitions

Any questions concerning this matter may be directed to Paralegal Liana Chase at (571) 272-3206.


Frances Hicks
Petitions Examiner
Office of Petitions
Office of the Deputy Commissioner
for Patent Examination Policy

cc: CHARLES J. KULAS
CARPTETER & KULAS, LLP
1900 EMBARCADERO ROAD, SUITE 109
PALO ALTO, CA 94303